CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXVII No. 9 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* September 1986

DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO

by NOEL HUNT

"An ill man is always ill, but he is worst of all when he pretends to be a saint."

Francis Bacon : Ornamenta Rationalia No. 28.

Many will have read, no doubt with warm approval, the Prime Minister's appeal to Mr. Brian Mulroney, Prime Minister of Canada. She asked Mr. Mulroney "to use his influence to help stave off pressures for sanctions against South Africa." We are told that Mr. Mulroney "is emerging as a key figure within the Commonwealth over South Africa." He is fashionably tough in his views. For instance "he is known to take a harder line on sanctions than Mrs Thatcher, and several black leaders have urged him to put pressure on the Prime Minister to change course." Obviously a man who knows what is right when he sees it, one feels. Right thinkers everywhere seem to support him. For instance, we are told that President Kenneth ("The Weeper") Kaunda of Zambia and several others have said that "they believe that Mr. Mulroney is the only Commonwealth leader able to make Mrs. Thatcher change her mind about sanctions." To prove Mr. Mulroney's impeccable integrationist credentials we are told that "Canada is in favour of sanctions, including a ban on air links, imports of fruit and vegetables and financial links."

So it comes as a very considerable shock to learn that in Mr. Mulroney's Canada the Eskimos, with the support of his government, are pushing for the creation of a huge Eskimo Homeland in the Far North. It is to contain 16,000 Eskimos and is to be named Nunavut, which is said to mean "Our Land." One notes with dismay that there is no hint of racial integration here : Nunavut is for Eskimos only. To the dispassionate observer there would seem to be absolutely no difference in principle between KwaZulu in South Africa and Nunavut in Canada. Both are to be occupied only by people of the proper race and by nobody else. Yet surely there must be some difference, mustn't there, or how would Mr. Mulroney be able to approve of Nunavut?

Men of goodwill, with Mr. Mulroney prominent in that horrible pack, claim loudly and incessantly that racial separation is deeply offensive to a notional concept known as "the conscience of mankind." It is not, however, offensive to the people of Canada's Northern Territory. They have voted to create a self-governing Eskimo Homeland. Just like Botswana or KwaZulu, in fact, but without all the hullabaloo. Nor is racial separation offensive to the Canadian Government, headed by Mr. Mulroney, which is financing the Homeland. Nor, in Canada, is separation of the races offensive to Mr. Mulroney, since he has not resigned over the issue of the Eskimo homeland.

Apartheid By Any Other Name

From this distance, it seems that the Canadian government is setting up in Canada precisely the system of *apartheid* which it condemns so strongly in South Africa. Perhaps Mr. Mulroney should be asked to explain precisely why, if it is bad in South Africa the same system should be good in Canada? Or perhaps he would prefer to tell us why and how what is good in Canada becomes bad in South Africa?

In South Africa the Zulu and the Tswana people, to name only two, feel that their way of life, their language and their customs are worth preserving. So they have accepted the offer of Homelands for their people. This has led to South Africa being universally execrated by the "world community," another figment of the liberal imagination. Yet the Eskimos, Mr Mulroney and the Canadian government can do precisely the same without a whisper of condemnation from anyone. Not a single publicity-seeking cleric has condemned either the Eskimos or the Canadian government. Not a single "media personality", "crusading journalist" or "opinion former" has spoken against, or even mentioned, this blatant extension of *apartheid* to Canada. No group of eminent pests has toured Canada tempting Canadians to resist the government of their country. Why not? We all know that they are active enough in South Africa. Why the difference?

Mr. Mulroney calls loudly for sanctions against South Africa because she did long ago what his own government are doing now in the Far North. It begins to look as if the man is a canting hypocrite of a stature to command respect even in England, which is the home of the breed.

The "world community" must brace itself for another shock. Canada and South Africa are not alone in their

deplorable taste for *apartheid.* It seems that the poison has spread to Arizona in the U.S.A. We learn with disbelief that the Senate of Arizona has voted to create an all-Indian homeland for the Mongoloid Navajo and Apache tribes. This area is to be called Dine, meaning "The people." It is all strongly reminiscent of Nunavut ("Our land") or KwaZulu ("Where the Zulu live.") Earnest white Americans, intent on racial integration, will note that they are not, in the eyes of the Apache and Navajo Indians, people at all. Only the Apache or a Navajo it seems can be a person. This is bad enough, a liberal might feel. But there is worse : in nearby Coconino Country the Indians have voted to have their own homeland. From this area they propose to exclude not only whites and Negroes, but Indians of other tribes as well. Yet there is not a word of protest from anyone. How can such an affront to the conscience of mankind, not to mention the world community, pass unreproved? Should they not, at the very least, "be pilloried at the bar of world opinion as has so often happened to South Africa?

It seems obvious that once again the opinion formers and men of goodwill are lying to us. Clearly, what is being attacked in South Africa is not a political institution of the white man, but the white man himself. South Africa is hated not because she believes in *apartheid,* but because she is white. The attack is not political at all, it is racial. What other explanation fits the facts? The intention is not to destroy *apartheid;* it is to destroy the white race.

People like Mr. Mulroney and all the numerous whites who attack South Africa are a new historical phenomenon. Never before has the world seen thousands of intelligent and articulate men who actively hate their own race and their own culture, and who work tirelessly to destroy them. Such men are the reason for the measureless contempt in which the white man is held throughout the world today. They have done what no other race will do : they have turned on their own kind.

CUT AND THRUST

by

You might think a free press would congratulate Harry Phibbs of the Federation of Conservative Students for his **New Agenda** piece on Mac and the Massacres. Hasn't his interview with Nikolai Tolstoy stimulated discussion of an important historical issue which has hitherto suffered from a considerable degree of censorship? Oh, no! **The Times, Telegraph** and **Mail** all wheeled on writers to claim that Macmillan's intention was good even if, with hindsight, it was a bad decision. The **Daily Express,** after chiding the Tory Party Chairman for "over-reacting" and thus giving transient notoriety to the **New Agenda** set, went on to report that when doddering old Lord Stockton himself was asked for his comments on the matter, he briefly said, "It was a long time ago." This earned a rousing accolade from the **Express,** which said that the aged peer could still masterfully show today's Tory leaders "how to deal with twerps".

"A long time ago," he said. Distance, in time or space, is sometimes relevant, then, but what are the criteria? None of the bother would have happened if another Conservative Leader, Neville Chamberlain, had acted on his horror that affairs in "a small country a **long way away**" should drag us towards war. Right or wrong, this sally of his gained him no credit in the long run; the **Daily Express** at the time may indeed have approved, but the present one favours the "twerps" who were all for war. I don't know if Macmillan has been prominent in pleading for another old gentleman on the grounds that his misdeeds, if such they were, took place "a long time ago." I mean, of course, Rudolph Hess. Somehow, too, I think that if Eichmann had lived this long he would not have lived much longer by suavely announcing to the Israeli court, "It was a long time ago, you twerps!" Nor could I imagine Macmillan urging "Let's forget" on the accusers.

* * * *

For several days in August the newspapers were full of stories about the Australian Budget, with everyone from their Federal Treasurer (who produced it) down telling us of Australia's parlous economic plight, with Australians wanting to live First World lives on a Third World financial foundation. Pensions, public and social services, tax reductions once hoped for, etc., must suffer. And that is with no international sanctions applied against them! A short time before, the news was all about an ex-Prime Minister of Australia – Malcolm Fraser – and a "Conservative" at that, over here for the Commonwealth Conference and urging economic sanctions against South Africa. Not a peep of concern did he utter about Australians sinking to Third World level.

Of course, *finance* is the key-word. There is no other reason for Australia's "poverty". When I was in Australia, the memories of "The Depression", meaning the 1930s financial one, surprised me by their vividness; in the 1950s and 1960s one heard and read frequent

allusions to those times, much more so than in England. All the stories of unemployment and general penury, in private conversations as well as in the media, were quite unexpected by me. Much less often, one heard of High Finance goings-on in those "a long time ago" days. Montague Norman, Governer of the Bank of England, came out to Australia to advise – to order? – the financial screws to be tightened, for instance. And he was listened to.

But, among these reminiscences of "The Great Depression", I – green as I was then – remember one sentence in B.A. Santamaria's **News Weekly** to the effect that the Depression had been an artificial thing, entirely imposed by International Finance. As readers know, the whole thing began with a crash on Wall Street : mere speculators. The actual words which impressed me were : "If the rest of the world had sunk beneath the sea there would have been no reason for any Australian not to have been well fed, clothed and housed."

* * * *

Can there be any doubt that if the rest of the world sank beneath the sea, South Africa could, actually, be doing very well, thank you? Better, perhaps; a case of "good riddance!" Something that, in those circumstances, would not be so important, though, is the fresh discovery of platinum deposits which *double* South Africa's reserves of this important mineral. At the same time we were told that now South Africa provides more than eighty per cent of "the Free World's" platinum. So it is truly heart-warming to realise that the Free World's and the Unfree World's statesmen pay scant heed to such things but are desperately concerned that black people should have votes.

Yes, votes are the universal panacea. Never mind the bombs in Democratic Spain or Democratic Portugal that are killing and maiming people. Never mind Muslims and Hindus killing each other in India, "the world's largest democracy", which ended with a corps of Indian Police moving in with very sensible orders to shoot looters on sight (Metropolitan Police, here please note!). Yesterday I heard news of a dozen Catholic nuns kidnapped by Muslims in the newly Democratic Phillipines. Also, a lot of freedom fighters in Afghanistan have been wiped out by Afghanistan Government troops. But that is not a Democratic country, is it? Only a *People's* Democracy. I have now just heard Neil Kinnock on **The World At One** urging sanctions against South Africa in the name of establishing *more* Democracy!

On a recent **Brain of Britain** contest, there was a question from H.L. Mencken that said: "Democracy is the theory that the people know what they want and deserve to get it – good and hard!" I would amend this to: "Democracy is the theory that the people know what they want – and do you know a neater way of *stopping* them getting it?"

* * * *

One thing "the people" have always known they want is an end to immigration – and how neatly the politicians of all shades have stopped us getting that! Indeed, so great are Establishment pressures in favour of "the multi-racial society" that on the recent anti-drugs-and-guns Police swoop on the Afro-Carribean Culture Centre in Brixton, officers were handing out sheaves of "Please excuse us : we really hate having to do it" leaflets.

The fact that the Brixton drugs den is called a Centre makes me all the more sure it is in receipt of funding from the rates and, no doubt, taxes – being ever-so-Inner City. And now I see in the give-away bulletin of my local Liberals that my own borough is to have an "Afro-Carribean Centre" (Wot? No Culture?) at a cost to us of a mere half a million pounds. This must obviously have been projected well before the drug-traffic at the Brixton one finally "provoked" a Police raid, but no doubt a little thing like that would not influence my local politicos. Far from it. Here and in Brixton, too, money spent on Ethnic Centres is considered money well spent, keeping the immigrants happy and thus alleviating their more unhappy tendencies.

* * * *

So *what* is ELSA? The initials of a charming pressure group : "End Loans to South Africa". They are snapping at the heels of the Church of England authorities, saying (according to the BBC) they are "living in sin" because of having funds invested in you-know-where. All of £300 million, they say. I have got no brief for the Church of England or its Trustees, but I think their spokesman on the radio was quite justified in mildly pointing out that ELSA was giving a totally false impression with its £300 million allegation, as this figure was the sum total of *all* the C. of E.'s investments in companies, mostly big ones, who had *some* involvement in South Africa. But, taken all round, the South African dimension in these companies was calculated as half of one per cent.

Anyway, in my book, it makes ELSA, with its "300 million pounds of Church funds invested in South Africa", guilty of what you could call a terminological inexactitude. Of course the Church of England are living in sin, but not on that score, except there might be some hypocrisy involved, but then only half of one per cent! They score much higher elsewhere in the hypocrisy stakes. The Trustee person also pointed out that the Law, as it regards Charities or trusteeship or whatever, left no option, as it required good stewardship on the part of the Trustees, which in turn meant that they must show they were achieving good security-cum-yield from the funds they were administering, in Mammon's terms.

Legally, living in sin does not come into it.

The ELSA outfit also said investing or trading with South Africa now was like selling gas ovens to be used to exterminate Jews in Germany in the 1930s. Yes, dear reader, I have seen the flaws, too! Gas ovens, indeed. Presumably, gas *chambers* were what he was thinking of, but then when dealing with the "Holocaust" myth words and their meanings are irrelevant and to query them is niggling. Of course, gas ovens could perhaps be a mistake for gas-fired crematoria instead. But, equally, any discussion as to whether there were such crematoria, let alone whether they were gas-fuelled, would be niggling. However, nobody – nobody at all – contends that the gas ovens/crematoria/chambers were installed, let alone started their grisly work, in the 1930s. More frequently, the analogy is unfortunate in that nobody can seriously imagine Hitler's pre-war Germany, any more than present-day Germany, requiring the *import* of gas-ovens from us, or anyone.

* * * *

With all the present and forthcoming Disarmament Conferences and the series of renunciations and conscessions generously offered by the USSR, I was reminded of that early 1930s statement by Dimitrov that when the time was ripe, "We will make unprecedented peace tentatives and concessions and the West will be overjoyed. Then, when their guard is down, we will smash them with our first." Well, his time, which he then reckoned at thirty years or so, is due and overdue now. Whether much "smashing with fist" will be needed to deal with the flabby, liberal West is questionable!

* * * *

The South African courts have been overturning South African Government Emergency Regulations in the last month or so. Can you imagine a British court in 1940 having the slightest prospect of overturning Defence Regulation 18B, which resulted in the internment of obviously patriotic British citizens? If the law had said such regulations were illegal, the Government would soon have replied : "Sorry. Emergency. What do you think Emergency means if not the over-riding of normal Law?" And the people interned – for years – without trial under 18B had not been rioting or committing murders or condoning them by the dozen and there were no widespread outbreaks of petrol-bombing, looting and necklacing tearing the country apart. The 18B people were law-abiding and some, now war had come, were keen to fight in the forces of the Crown and there was no need to lock them all up, and no excuse, when our regime was calling on us to "Lend to Defend the Right to be Free." But such are the ways of Democracy.

When the Communist Black Minority – you bet it will be minority! – Government is in power in South Africa, of course, White organisations will be perfectly free to mount big anti-Government propaganda operations, protest demonstrations, maintain free relations and contact with anti-Black South African organisations and governments overseas, with constant coming and going of white agitators, organisers and all manner of sympathisers, without let or hindrance. Naturally, the whites would not need to set up headquarters or training camps abroad, as they would be welcome to have them within South African territory.

If, even, there were to be such a Black regime, would there be the white resisters? Silly question, because such a benign regime would hardly call for resistance. But that is *not* the regime that is in prospect! And the whites are not, and have not been, doing much resisting. I wish at this point I could remember correctly Churchill's words, which certainly apply. If you won't fight now, when the struggle would be short and easy and victory certain (a stage long past in South Africa), the time will come when the option will be a grievous and costly struggle which won't leave you unscathed; and if you refuse *that* choice, you will finally be faced with having to wage a grim and desperate fight for your very survival, with no guarantee of even that much success. But with a Democracy, which is what the white South Africans have got, the voters *want* to be deceived, to continue "sipping their gins beside their swimming pools", as a distinctly unfriendly commentator put it recently.

* * * *

Radio Four's **Sunday** programme tells me a Joint Christian committee (or something) has been set up in Northern Ireland to produce a Joint Christian condemnation of murder. Jolly good. They do not stop short there, either, but have a positive suggestion to contribute. Dialogue. Well, you'd never have guessed, would you? Even the BBC interviewer talking to the man I presume to be head of this Joint Christian committee *had* to say to him, "But will this new statement have any more effect than all the previous ones?" Answer : Dunno, but Christians had better be on record as having protested, like.

No doubt if the Communist IRA do something particularly horrific in the way of a successful big bomb in a shopping area or under a school bus or something, the Catholic Hierarchy will feel it incumbent upon them to issue another strong condemnation. They may even abhor it, like apartheid. Or almost.

* * * *

When the Police arrested the "Stockwell Strangler", who had murdered and sexually assaulted eight or nine

male and female pensioners in the Lambeth area, they announced that it was a white man. How naughtily racist, at least judged by the National Union of Journalists' Code of Conduct, which rules that the colour of a criminal should not be reported unless it has something to do with the offence. (Even under this, if a description of a *wanted* person mentioned colour, that could hardly be objected to. But when a suspect is *caught* his colour, by the NUJ standard, is immaterial.) *Then* we were informed the Police were to release the Strangler's picture, in order to help trace his movements before arrest. What did the newspapers show? Why, the photograph of a *black* man, or someone I would readily concede was a half-caste. If I have criticised the indecent haste of the Police in annoucing a white man was white, I must refrain from profanity when I find he wasn't – a white man.

* * * *

How many of my readers, I wonder, failed to be numbered among the glittering throng invited to the enthronement of Desmond as Archbishop of Cape Town? Me, too-too! In fact, I think it would be harder for thou and I to enter the Cathedral of Cape Town than for a Tamil to pass through the eye of a Canadian! Shalom!

Janus

DEFORMATION THEOLOGY

The effective employment of the "anti-semitic taboo," together with Zion's now-perfected blackout and smotherout techniques, has also concealed the extent to which the deformation of historic Christianity by the present Christian leadership in the United States and in the West, and its secularisation into a form of Jewish faith, is now far advanced.

The Christianity that was once accepted by our White race and was still a bulwark of Western civilisation seventy years ago, and still a vital force fifty years ago, is now *withering on the vine.*

What is preached today from the pulpits of most churches as being official Christian doctrine, would have been regarded as unmistakably and demonstrably *anti-Christian* in the 1930's.

So much so, that almost all of the churches that are today called Christian in the U.S. and elsewhere, have virtually become anti-Christian heresies.

Christianity – as a religion once fit for the survival of Western man, his nations and civilisation – is systematically being undermined and destroyed by present-day leaders of the Christian world.

Thanks to those present-day leaders modern-day Christianity, in fact, is fast being supplanted by "Judeo-Christianity," the subversive creed devised by Zionist and communist Jews for their own global political ends – *their Pax Judaica.*

And the consequent ruination of Western civilisation, which is today being wrought by the U.S. and by the Zionist and communist Jews, who control the U.S. from behind the scenes, is a direct result of the prevailing mania that the U.S. has a "Judeo-Christian" mission to civilise the world and make the world "safe for democracy!"

One can search Christian literature through the centuries and nowhere has the phrase "Judeo-Christian heritage" ever been used until just a few years ago. That was when the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith and the American Jewish Congress, and their associated groups, stooges, and sycophants, began popularising this malicious myth.

The result has been that today this unholy refrain is being repeated parrot-like by Catholic priests and prelates and by protestant bishops and clergymen of every denomination, who have been encouraged to regard the expression as a mark of sophisticated liberalism, and as evidence that they are completely free of the so-called sin of "Christian anti-semitism"!

With acknowledgement to the Editor S. A. Observer.

IS THERE A JEWISH QUESTION?

One thing has never been in doubt: the quite disproportionate Jewish influence within the camp of Revolutionary Marxism. This was particularly evident in the 1917 Revolution, for the overwhelming majority of the Old Bolsheviks were Jewish. But it is also true of Revolutionary Marxism across the Atlantic. As a Jewish correspondent pointed out in a letter dated June 6, 1984, rebuking the Toronto *Globe and Mail* for having alleged Sandinsta discrimination against Jews, not only do Jewish businessmen continue to flourish in Nicaragua, but, in addition, the Sandinista Cabinet includes no fewer than four Jews despite the fact that Nicaragua is overwhelmingly Catholic (95.5%, according to the *World Christian Encyclopedia).*

The Remnant (30/4/86)

RED ALL OVER

by MARK EWELL

The publisher's blurb says this book* is a major contribution to the study of international Communism, a definitive history of the Italian Communist Party (the PCI) from the 1920s to the early 1980s, and indeed it is all they claim it to be. For here is an exhaustive account of the propaganda techniques and brazen *volte-faces* of a party wriggling under duress from Moscow. All is in the tradition of Machiavelli himself.

The author details every phase in the struggles of the PCI to break free from Soviet ideological authority and organizational domination, and to reach the Socialist Utopia in its own way, at its own pace, in collaboration with reform-minded Democrats, Christian or otherwise. This was the famous *compromesso storico* of Togliatti whose career is treated so sensitively that even the anti-Communist reader is in danger of disorientation and of falling into a kind of admiration of this Marxist intellectual and Communist militant with a human, if somewhat shifty, face!

But, seriously, what can **Candour** readers learn from this tome? Corroboration of the little understood fact that Lenin's "democratic centralism", or direct rule from Moscow, is less of a threat to the West than the PCI's gradualist approach to revolution. Togliatti demanded that "everywhere there must be demands of a transitional character, opening the path to struggle for power."

An old English adage advises that it is sugar that catches the flies, not vinegar. It must be an old Italian adage, too! Certainly, its efficacy has been proved in Italy. Now the PCI is the largest Communist Party in western Europe.

The author tells us that the PCI has always strongly supported the EEC, having joined Italian delegates to the Euro-Assembly as far back as 1969. PCI members have actively contributed to the Assembly's deliberations ever since. Furthermore, Comrade Altierro Spinelli's preliminary Draft Treaty establishing European Union has been the inspiration and base of the succeeding documents culminating in the Single European Act.

In the 1920s both Lenin and Trotsky looked forward to the realization of a United Soviet States of Europe. Thanks to the Italian Communists, this dream is on the way to fulfilment through new institutional means. These have been set up by way of the transitional slogans and cheating ploys that have led to the European Union now being effected by the Parliaments of all twelve members of the EEC.

It is strange that the veteran Spinelli does not feature at all in this all-inclusive book.

*__PCI — Moscow and the Italian Communist Party__ by Joan Barth Urban. Published by I.B. Tauris, price £24.50.

FESTIVAL FOR THE GRAND ARCHITECT?

On June 19th., 1955, one of the earliest inter-faith meetings took place at the San Francisco Cow Palace.

Supposedly in honour of the tenth anniversary of the United Nations, it was called the United Nations Festival of all Faiths.

All religions took part, except two. There were Buddhists, Hindus, Moslims, Confucians, Jews and many shades of Protestantism. John Foster Dulles, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, represented the World Council of Churches and the US National Council of Churches. The meeting, backed by the highest level government and religious leaders, was, in effect, syncretic. The two glorious exceptions who boycotted it were the Lutherans and the Roman Catholic Church.

But what of the same kind of meeting on the occasion of the UN Festival of Peace on October 24th of this year to be held at Assisi *and called by Pope John-Paul II himself?* This is also a syncretic meeting. But wasn't syncretism condemned by Pope Paul VI in his encyclical *Evangeelii Nuntiandi* in 1975 and on his visit to India in 1964?

The first General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, the late Dr. Visser t'Hooft, in his book **No Other Name: The Choice Between Syncretism And Christian Universalism,** called syncretism "a far more dangerous challenge to the Christian Church than full-fledged atheism is ever likely to be."

Now, only thirty-one years after the UN Festival of all Faiths, syncretism is getting the go-ahead from the Pope himself and will be virtually impossible to resist even if John-Paul II does make some "fine print" reservations.

I can foresee the Great Apostacy foretold in Scripture looming up ahead.

JOHN COTTER

FAREWELL TO "REDBEARD"

We profoundly regret to announce the death in June of Austen Brooks at the age of 61. In the 1950s and '60s, he gave over twelve years of steadfast and often heroic service to the fight against the betrayal of the British nations as Deputy Editor of **Candour,** Deputy Chairman of the League of Empire Loyalists and, briefly, as Deputy Chairman of the National Front.

Austin's youth was spent amidst the hazards of war at sea. His experience ranged from service in battleships to the command of landing craft during the Normandy invasion. On demobilisation, he joined the staff of **Truth** and there learnt to fight a different kind of war under the brave banner of his brilliant father, Collin Brooks. A.K. Chesterton, then Deputy Editor of **Truth,** liked and respected Austen, but it was not until **Truth** changed hands that AK saw something of his real quality. The new owners, while they would not suffer Collin Brooks or AK, were anxious to retain the services of young Brooks, and his prospects would have been bright had he chosen to stay. But at that junction a matter of professional principle arose and Austen resigned on the spot.

Eighteen months later, when RK Jeffery made generous funds available for **Candour's** expansion, AK had no hesitation in offering Austen Brooks the post of Deputy Editor. He wanted a conscientious journalist, a man of honour and a political fighter who could be relied upon at all times to face the enemy. In Austen, he knew these qualities were to be found.

Austen was a gentle person. His courage was of that splendid, nervous kind which has nothing of aggression in it, and certainly nothing of exhibitionism. In fighting for what he believed to be right he willed himself into taking action from which, as a private person, he would shrink. For instance, dressing up in garments resembling an Eastern archbishop's attire so as to protest against an invitation to Makarios by gate-crashing the Lambeth Conference in what was a famous League exploit. Austen was always in the front line, taking the tactical initiative and, with the League's activist teams, at the receiving end of whatever rough stuff was handed out be followers of CND or the Movement for Colonial Freedom.

The responsibility for helping keep the **Candour**-League movement in being imposed an enormous strain on his reserves of nervous energy; so much so that a short time after the LEL-BNP merger, he became seriously ill with a servere nervous breakdown and was forced to withdraw from the battle-line.

Austen Brooks' physical and moral courage was as immense as the man himself – he stood 6'4". We salute "Redbeard", a magnificent Englishman, for his devoted and selfless service to the Cause.

ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE.

AUSTEN BROOKS

MRS. JOYCE GITTENS

It is with further regret that we inform readers of the death of Mrs. Joyce Gittens. Hers was a lifetime of patriotic endeavour. Before the war, she was a speaker for the first ever Blackshirt movement in Britain and organised the Anti-Communist Children's Clubs in the East End of London. In the 'fifties, she became Assistant Secretary of the Britons, later marrying Anthony Gittens, Chairman of that pioneering publishing house. Theirs was an intrepid partnership, under whose unerring hand scores of patriotic books was published, many of which were considered too dangerous for "respectable" companies to handle. We mourn her passing.

Evolution Hoax Exposed

by

A. N. Field

£2.00

from Candour Publishing Co,
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

MILITANT AND MAMMON

The news that left-wing Liverpool City Council avoided its latest financial crisis in August by agreeing to an £18 million loan from the Yasudo Bank of Japan is yet another demonstration that the two apparent opposites, Socialism and Capitalism, are two different words for the same thing, as Belloc observed in **The Servile State.**

This is the third time the **Militant**-controlled Council has made multi-million pound deals with foreign bankers to balance its budget, thus confirming Belloc's argument that "all so-called Socialist experiments in municipalisation and nationalisation were merely increasing the dependence of the community upon the capitalist class."

Almost 75 years on, Hilaire Belloc's economic grasp seems "quietly admirable", says his biographer, A.N. Wilson, when we consider his Utopian contemporaries like Shaw, Wells and the Webbs believed that a collectivist state could flourish *without* Capitalism. In fact, as the Soviet Union's Wall Street connections show, collectivist states depend more, and not less, than capitalist ones on the power of bankers and brokers to bail them out and pay their bills.

"WE'RE WETTER" – BBC

On its **Today** programme the BBC gave us an interview with an Amsterdam Superintendent of Police, who had been involved with the British football fans' vicious brawling in Amsterdam. Our BBC man, and this was fair enough, asked if the British fans had been provoked by the opposing fans. His convincing answer was in the negative. But then our BBC man had to ask the half-wit question: were there so many police present that *this* constituted a provocation? Mercifully, the Amsterdam police officer (in a conversation in a *foreign* language, remember) was quite competent to reply, in his entirely adequate English, that in the stadium the police presence ensured the separation of the fans and there was no violence there. For anyone of intelligence – alas, a limited company – there was no need, even had he been given the chance, for him to argue that a massive police presence *all over town* could have ensured that our cowardly fans would have been constrained to abide within the law – in Amsterdam, anyway.

What made this interview super-appalling? The fact that the unequivocal condemnation, *vis-a-vis* the BBC, came from *Holland,* where the wettest, most liberal regime that one imagined conceivable rules the roost.

FIGHTING SPIRIT

We think that there might be a simple solution to the dilemma facing those left-wing Inner London teachers who fear the effect of competitive races on their young charges. The Good Lord advised us that the last shall be first and that the first shall be last. If they – the teachers – were to follow this precept and make the winners the losers and the losers the winners, the resultant chaos would soon have them clamouring for the restoration of the status quo.

TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY

Elizabeth Freeman's 'commonplace book' that puts the materialism of the age in its true perspective, analyses the plan for world revolution and warns of the perils ahead.

BE SURE OF YOUR COPY NOW

£10 UK $15 USA £12.50 ELSEWHERE

FROM

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

WHISPER ON THE RIGHT

Recently we heard Conservative MP, Mr. John Carlisle, referring to the football hooligans, calling for what indeed we would like as treatment for criminals: birching, anyway servere physical pain, and long periods of imprisonment in grim conditions. Fine, and perhaps Mr. Carlisle, and other Conservative MPs, would advocate the same for muggers and a lot of other criminals. Interestingly, the particular outburst of crime which spurs the Carlisles of the Tory Right to bellow for the birch, etc., – and guarantee being media-reported – happens to be an outburst of crime by *whites.* After hideous riots last autumn, did we hear Mr. Carlisle, or suchlike, trumpetting forth that "ethnic" firebombers, looters, killers (remember?) should get effective treatment? Well, did we?

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum	
U.K. - - - - - -	£5.00	
Overseas - - -	£6.00	Airmail
U.S. Dollar Rate -	$10.00	"

FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.